special
collections

douglas
library

queen's university
at kingston

kingston ontario canada

[Sabin 20241
publn Boston

A

DISCOURSE

ON

GOVERNMENT

AND

RELIGION,

Calculated for the MERIDIAN of the

THIRTIETH of JANUARY.

By an INDEPENDENT.

Ye know nothing at all, neither consider that it is expedient for us, that one Man should die for the People, and that the whole Nation perish not. CAIAPHAS.

SALUS POPULI SUPREMA LEX ESTO.

LONDON:

Printed for J. ROBERTS in *Warwick-lane*, and M. SHEEPEY under the *Royal Exchange*.

AC911.1749.I52

THE PREFACE.

THO' this is the place of a Preface, what I have to ſay, more than the contents that follow, being not the ſubject of the day in the title-page, but of the preſent times, I think it may not improperly be called, *a Poſtſcript by way of Preface.*

There is now much talk about altering the *Common Prayer*; no one doubts of the need of doing it, but pore-blind bigots; but how to alter it to pleaſe every one, is an unſurmountable difficulty. I own I have read none of the arguments publiſhed on this ſubject: however, I will give my opinion, that if it be at all altered, it ought to be in ſuch a manner, as will beſt pleaſe *all conſcientious and reaſonable men*, and that in my judgment will be, not to alter the book, but the uſe of it; not to aboliſh a ſyllable or ceremony of it, but let it remain juſt as it is. Let every pariſh prieſt either uſe the whole, or leave out what part he pleaſes, or let it all alone, not allowing him to introduce any *new* ceremonies, for that would be a leading towards popery; but leave out as many of the old ones as he thinks proper; that he who is to pray for others, may pray in what manner he judges beſt, either by that form, or by any other of his own compoſing, or by none. So the prieſt enjoying liberty of conſcience himſelf, will feel the ſweetneſs of it, and be willing that others ſhould enjoy the ſame felicity. How can any one pray, or teach, according to the beſt of his judgment, in ſincerity of his conſcience, that is denied the liberty

of

of doing it? Upon the rock of private judgment and liberty of conſcience, ſtands the reformation. That no ceremonies ſhould be impoſed on men in religious matters, nor doctrines, but ſuch as agree with their reaſon and the Bible, is the foundation of proteſtancy; and if this was freely permitted, all bigotry in religion, which is the ſcandal of it, would be done away. Men will not then perſecute one another in words, or deeds, about things indifferent, nor eſteem them eſſentials. All *good* and *wiſe* men both clergy and laity will be pleaſed, and none diſpleaſed but ſuperſtitious, arbitrary and unreaſonable tempers. And ſuch good conſequence is as much as can be expected or deſired, when any alteration is made, on any account, in any time or place in the world. An unalterable conformity to any one ſyſtem, is preſumption to expect, and tyranny to impoſe, unleſs the men appointing it were infallible. But infallibility is God's peculiar property, according ro proteſtant doctrine; and is doubtleſs an infallible truth: therefore to leave men free in religion, is true proteſtant practice. To give this liberty in public devotion, is to make but *one* alteration; but to alter the book, will be to make an alteration, which, however made, will want altering again and again without end. But by this method, all the people as well as all their guides will pleaſe themſelves, for then if too many or too few, too much or too little ceremonies, be uſed at one church to pleaſe any perſon, thoſe that diſlike may go to another, where the worſhip is more agreeable to them. All the conformity that God requires, is to the dictates of a pure conſcience; and all the religious conformity neceſſary for ſocial life and happineſs, is, *that ſupplications, prayers, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings, and all that are in authority*, the manner *how* ſhould be left to the diſcretion of him that does it, *ſo that we may lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all godlineſs and honeſty*; and that men ſhould be adviſed and counſelled how to act as the reaſon and nature of their circumſtances require, with all moral and commendable conduct.

A DISCOURSE ON GOVERNMENT, &c.

AFTER a hundred years contention and animosity about the good or evil of *one* action, it is time that men's passions should subside, and that they growing calm and sedate, without enthusiasm and bigotry, should reflect and reason on the subject; and 'tis fit that those who have the savour of good sense should exercise it. —Those who are not able to form a rational judgment of things, are liable to every deception; they cannot possibly tell when they are deceived, and for want of judgment can never be convinced: therefore such must go their own way, till suffering opens their understandings; then they wish, too late, they had reflected in time. As when men feel the effects of slavery, they wish for freedom, who never valued it, when they enjoyed it; nor endeavoured to preserve it, when they were in imminent danger of losing it. But were it not for the *careless* and the *coward*, mankind could never be enslaved.—— As for my own

part, I am determined to write for *liberty*, while I have liberty to write, ſeeing in theſe happy days of freedom, we now enjoy that natural and reaſonable liberty, which is the natural and reaſonable right of mankind, and reaſon therefore may ſpeak without fear: But when *tyrants* reign, reaſon for liberty is ſuppreſſed; becauſe it is feared.———I am of no levelling ſpirit: I think ſovereigns are made to rule, and ſubjects to obey, the laws governing both; the laws I mean made by the governing powers, that are according to equity, and moral juſtice. —— Such a government ought not to be abuſed, nor to ſuffer abuſe from malecontents, that enjoy equal liberties with their fellow ſubjects; whoſe murmuring is only to make men deſpiſe the heavenly *manna* they at preſent reliſh, to bring them back to the ancient ſlavery of *Egypt*, to lordly and prieſtly tyranny, which freeborn ſouls abhor; or to the ſtinking *garlick* of popery, which is loathed by men of taſte.——Some men are of ſuch ſervile and ſtupid diſpoſitions, that they think whatever is the will of the ſovereign, is law. If he was God himſelf, a Being not capricious, but neceſſarily ſo perfect, that it is abſolutely impoſſible for him to be the author of an *evil law*, it would be ſo, and right in being ſo. If his laws like God's were perfectly juſt, becauſe his will is abſolutely good, not becauſe he is abſolutely powerful; for power and goodneſs are diſtinct and different things; therefore the one may be where the other is not; and very ſeldom meet together in man. They can only be cemented by wiſdom and juſtice. This cannot be where weak-headed men are poſſeſſed of power; for where ambitious and ſelf-conceited men bear rule (which is the natural conſequence of ſtrong paſſions and weak intellects) the event naturally is, that deſtruction attends

tends not only all thoſe, their arm of vengeance is capable of reaching; but alſo, that they over-reach themſelves to their own fatal downfal and juſtly merited ruin.——If to enſlave a nation is an *inglorious* and *diſhonourable* thing to the doer; to redeem a nation from ſlavery is a *glorious* and an *honourable* action. If men have a natural right to the enjoyment of civil and religious liberties, they have a natural right to aſſert and maintain theſe liberties, and to defend them by what means they can. When neceſſity calls for it, it is not any unnatural rebellion, but a natural and noble ſtand for liberty: but to rebel without this cauſe, *as has been lately done*, is to attempt the deſtruction of our moſt valuable liberties, and to ſet up tyranny and ſlavery in its room; which if attempted by a king, renders him the moſt deteſtable of all kings; and if by a people, proves them the moſt baſe and ungrateful of all people. A king is then a tyrant, when he will not be governed by the laws of the country he ought to be governed by: But as long as he governs himſelf by them, thoſe laws are his protection. On the contrary, he that makes his arbitrary and deſpotic will, the law of the nation, is a tyrant; and as he does and would reign without the law of reaſon and juſtice, he is, or ought, in reaſon and juſtice to be outlawed. And every prieſt that preaches up the doctrine of paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance to ſuch a prince, is a traitor to the liberties of the people. When the people's liberties are intended to be taken away, then, and only then, ſuch doctrine is neceſſary to be preached to the ſtupid and unthinking herd; that while they are lulled aſleep in ſpiritual ſtupefaction, their properties may be invaded without obſtruction; and their natural rights ſtolen from them without impediment. The king and the prieſt, ſo

joining to play their part, are like two robbers, that, at their attacking a man upon the highway, one of them throws duſt in his eyes, while the other robs him of what he has. What's the reaſon that prieſts don't preach this high-flown doctrine now? It is *firſt* becauſe the prince intends no invaſion on the liberties of his ſubjects, and *ſecondly*, becauſe they have got a king they can't make an eccleſiaſtic noodle of. When fools reign, they have always knaves at their elbow. When a king is deſirous to enſlave the people, there are always ſome *black* counſellors at hand, that ſeek their own advancement in the common ruin. If he take it into his head to ſide with the church and clergy in doing it, they will ſanctify all his actions, aſſert his birthright from above, caſt a ray of glory around him, and make him appear a ſaint, or one of the minor ſons of God.

Notwithſtanding the wicked, ſtupid, and damning doctrine of paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance, men have a right to ſtand up in their own defence, when their lives and liberties are invaded; for *ſelf-defence* is the greateſt law in nature, it is interwoven in the conſtitution of every creature, and ſuch unnatural doctrines cannot extirpate it.

Let not kings be deceived by falſe notions; when by wicked actions, they have loſt the love of the people in general, they can have no ſafety from the people; but are in the caſe of poor debtors, that dare not truſt themſelves abroad for fear of a bailiff. But a few malecontents, and a faction againſt the court, will always be, 1*ſt*. By ſome, becauſe they are out of place. 2*dly*. By others, becauſe they ſuffer themſelves eaſily to be deceived, and are generally diſſatisfied. And 3*dly*, Thoſe that are jealous of their liberties will always fear the worſt, and therefore grumble at whatever does not

not ſeem to them to have a favourable aſpect, or appears to have an ill tendency; theſe I may call *court ſpies*; but it is a ſign of liberty in the ſtate, when the people are permitted to be watchful of it, and even allowed a jealous murmur or complaint.

The action of this day, being done contrary to the *intereſt*, and therefore contrary to the *diſpoſitions* of the prieſts, it was policy in them to blacken it, and make it a ſin, which now they have prayed above theſe hundred years to be forgiven. And if it is not forgiven by this time, they either pray to a ſtrange God, or they are a ſtrange ſort of prayers, that work no manner of effect upon him: He either hears them not, or don't think them worthy his regard, and ſo they may pray on till Doomſday.——When God, the King, and the People are to be mocked, there is no better way of doing it, than by practiſing it with the face of Religion. The cavaliers pray for the forgiveneſs of a ſin they never committed; and ſo they have mocked God, ever ſince they have begun to practice repentance on this ſcore——Thoſe that are moſt guilty of hypocriſy, cry out moſt againſt others for being hypocrites. What is it but hypocriſy, for men to pretend to repent of what no man in the age they live in is guilty of; or to attempt by ſour penitence to atone for an action of the generation now dead, and which thoſe that committed, were not conſcious of its being a crime in the nature and reaſon of the thing?—But however it be, if they have committed a crying ſin before God, and have not anſwered for it by this time before God, there is no truth in our Religion.—Why then ſhould we, a degenerate race, condemn; and whining, pretend to repent of the action they did, and thought themſelves right in doing? If we are to anſwer for it, where is the juſtice

ſtice of God? If we believe we ſhall be anſwerable for their faults, where's the rationality of our belief? But I expect to be told that the *Lord viſits the iniquities of the fathers upon their children to the third and fourth generation.* What upon thoſe children who had no hand in the action of their fathers, and who cannot be guilty of it! To aſſert this is as ridiculous, as impious. This is juſt as right, as it would be to laſh a boy at ſchool, that never played truant in his life, becauſe his father or grandfather play'd the truant, and was not whipt for it. *Ezekiel* (chap. xviii.) tells us, that God ſaid *then*, and I ſuppoſe he has not changed his mind ſince; *the ſoul that ſinneth ſhall die, the ſon ſhall not bear the iniquity of the father*, &c. This chapter is a good explanation of the threatening annexed to the ſecond commandment.—The truth is, there are *families*, as well as *nations*, that tread in their predeceſſors ſteps, and the *ſon* goes on in the ſame wicked path the *father* did (as *James* II. followed *Charles* I.) till their iniquities are full; that is, till they can be borne with no longer; and then *juſtice* fully incenſed, whets her vengeful ſword, and cuts them off. Seldom does it happen, that tyrannical kings treading in the ſteps of their wicked anceſtors, proſper to the *fourth* generation; but according as their iniquity is, as to time and meaſure, they are cut down in the *ſecond* or *third* ſucceſſion. So the ſins of *James* I. which his ſon *Charles* walked in, helped forward his fall. — It is the mercy of God to mankind, that tyranny and oppreſſion ſhall naturally ſtir up the vengeance of an incenſed people, *to bind the heathen kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron. Such honour have all his ſaints, praiſe ye the Lord*, ſays the * Pſalmiſt. This is an honour due to none but *ſaints*, that is, to a people

* Pſalm cxlix. 8.

ple worthy of redemption. And kings that perſecute chriſtians are heathens to them.

It is the duty of ſubjects to defend and obey a *good* Ptince, and oppoſe a *bad* one ; for all oppoſition to evil is good. The people, that obey a wicked prince, will be wicked ; for a tame ſubmiſſion to his vices, will corrupt their morals. And his *religious vices*, moſt of all ; becauſe they are not ſeen as vices, being gilded over with religion. By this means ſlavery and iniquity may be planted, and take deep root in a nation.

Right government is, when the governor and governed mutually agree, and are mutually benefited: When they harmonize, they make each other happy. The chief end of government is the ſafety and tranquillity of the people, in which the prince finds his account: Their duty is to ſerve and protect each other.——Subjects diſobeying a lawful prince, are juſtly puniſhed ; and he is a lawful prince, whom the power and will of the people appoint, and who rules according to law.—He that redeems a people from ſlavery, or from thoſe arbitrary meaſures that preſent them with an approaching proſpect of it, has a right to rule over them ; and as he is their *rightful*, ſo he is their *lawful prince* if he don't enſlave them.——Kings are the ſervants of the public, and if they deſerve well of the public, they ought to be well rewarded by the public. But ſervants that do not their duty, ought to be diſcarded their ſervice. He that deſtroys the public peace, whoſe duty it is to preſerve it, deſerves public puniſhment, whatever his office or ſtation be in the public ſervice. As it is hard to puniſh governors, without injury to the governed, if they can get rid of them at any rate, they muſt be contented ; for formal juſtice cannot be executed on thoſe that are above the reach of juſtice. Juſtice

cannot

cannot always be executed where it ought, but ought always where it can, without regard to perſons.—He that reigns according to the laws of the country, is not to be eſteemed a bad prince; but if bad laws are complained of, and he can rectify them, but does not, he is not a good prince; for every one that is made ſenſible of his duty, ought to do it, if it be in his power. A prince may be ſo far miſ-led, as to agree to the making laws that may be productive of grievances to a nation; becauſe he may not apprehend they will turn out ſuch; but when he finds they do, by the complaints of the people, if he don't endeavour to redreſs them, he is a bad governor.—Neceſſary Taxes muſt be raiſed to ſupport governments, and when it is done in a legal way, according to the laws of the country, and applied to the neceſſary emergencies of State, it is a proof of diſaffection, in perſons that can afford to pay their taxes, to grumble at paying them. And if people at this time pay more taxes than formerly, they are much more able to do it, becauſe of the great increaſe of trade; though the poor have always enough to do to live, and live honeſtly; therefore thoſe only that are able to pay taxes, ſhould be tax'd; for to demand of any man what is not in his power to do, cannot be the demands of that law which is *holy, juſt and good.*——But kings that impoſe taxes on their Subjects without law, and take away their rights and properties becauſe they have power to do it; and do it, becauſe it is to their advantage, are but more powerful robbers. And thoſe that diſtreſs and deſtroy their ſubjects, that they may the better ſubdue and enſlave them, to enhance their own arbitrary power, are tyrants and wicked rulers. *As a roaring lion and a raging bear, ſo are theſe over the poor people.*——Is it not juſt to remove the cauſes of common calamity by the death

death of the principal perſon, which nothing but his death could remove, or the death of the people from their oppreſſions? Is it *better*, in ſuch caſe, *that one man die, or the nation periſh?*

The promoters and abettors of ſlavery endeavour to enforce and ſanctify tyranny by one text of St. *Paul*, *Rom.* xiii. 1, 2. *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God; and they that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves damnation.*——Theſe words have been made a ſhameful handle of by ſhameleſs prieſts, for ſhameful ends and purpoſes.——According to the ſeeming ſenſe of theſe words, if by *higher powers*, be meant *perſons in power*, every one that is inveſted with power, has his power from God; and every ſoul muſt ſubmit to it on the peril of damnation. As there is nothing of *hereditary right* in the text, it does not patronize the ſlaviſh principles of paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance to one family, or ſet of men, more than to another. But if every one in power muſt be paſſively obey'd, on the peril of damnation, a worſe doctrine cannot be taught to enſlave the world than this; and ſavours more of a revelation from the infernal tyrant, than the revelation of the *glorious liberty of the ſons of God*. This then is the doctrine not of *Paul*, but of prieſts: 'Tis not *goſpel*, but *prieſtcraft*; for the Devil then in power muſt not be reſiſted, but obeyed.—I apprehend this doctrine is againſt *levellers*; againſt thoſe that would be ſubject to, or governed by no power; who are for no king in this world, but *king Jeſus*, no governor to exerciſe the authority of rule over them: Whereas God has ordained, that there ſhall be ſome men having higher power than the reſt, to govern the reſt; and he that reſiſts this ordinance

of God, and order of nature, is a rebel to God and man; and will meet with his juſtly-merited condemnation; for this is to overturn all order and government among men; without which, all manner of evil may be committed with impunity.—The apoſtle don't ſay, *all perſons in power* are to be obeyed; but the *power*, that is, every order, and office, appointed by the public, for the public good. Every one in a ſuperior office ought to be obeyed in ſuch a manner as is neceſſary. 'Tis the office, the ſubjection is due to, for 'tis this, that gives the power to the perſon poſſeſſing it, whoever the perſon be, not for the ſake of his perſon, but of his office and authority: So far as his office, place, authority, or power requires he ſhould be obeyed, in ſuch manner and degree he ought to be obeyed; and he that does ſo, ſubmits himſelf to the *power* rather than to the *perſon*, or only to the perſon for the office, power, and authority ſake; not becauſe ſo it *muſt* be, but becauſe ſo it *ſhould* be, or it is right ſo to do; for governing powers are the ordinance of God.——But if he in office does not uſe the power *right* which he is poſſeſſed of, he has no right to poſſeſs it; he forfeits his right by the ill uſe he makes of it: Obeying him in ſuch caſe, is not obeying the ordinance of God, as his miniſter for good; 'tis obeying man rather than God; what *the man in office*, not what *the office of the man* requires. Thus we ſhould diſtinguiſh between the perſon and the power.——Every man in life has a power given him to ſome *end*, and if he uſes his power to a different end than what he ought to do, he abuſes it; and not uſing it right, it is right to take it from him.—— If kings can do no wrong, it is becauſe as ſoon as they do wrong, they ceaſe *of right* to be kings. A good office muſt be executed by a good man. The man ſhould be fitted for the office he is to execute, or he is diſ-

qualified

qualified for the office, and ſo cannot ſerve it, cannot be what he is appointed, becauſe he is not qualified for it. So that a king ruling wickedly, is not a king; therefore the people that kill, or caſt off ſuch a man, don't kill, or caſt off their king, only one that would have been their king if he had been properly qualified for that high office and ſacred dignity; and one that has unking'd himſelf by diſcovering his inability to reign. He is not a huſband, that takes no care of his wife and family, and ſhe that is a whore, is not a wife.

It is cauſe of wonder, how it ſhould ever come into the head of any man to imagine, he ought to be obeyed as a God. It is an evident ſign of the devil in man, that ſets himſelf up in the place of God. It is making an idol of a prince, to bring the judgments of God upon him. It is a doctrine that nothing but a prieſt could invent, or one that intended to raiſe his king the *higher*, that he might fall the *lower*. A ſpiritual trap to catch an unwary prince in, to fetter him to his everlaſting and irretrievable ruin.

If *Charles* had not been a great enthuſiaſt, it could never have come into his head, that any king on earth could poſſibly be ſo much a favourite of God, as that he indulged him to do what he pleaſed, without being accountable as men ought to be that break the laws of ſociety. — Are not kings men? and no body but prieſts, madmen, or fools ever ſuppoſed or ſaid they were more than men; and if ſo, then they are under the ſame laws of God in this world that all mankind are. Their office and power indeed makes it reaſonable, that if they reign well, they ſhould be more valued and reſpected than other men; becauſe they are the authors of more good and benefit to men; but if they reign ill, they are leſs valued than other men; becauſe they are the cauſe of much more evil and injury to men than

others are.——Or rather why ſhould God *hate* kings more than other men, that he ſhould indulge them in the practice of more wickedneſs than others, to enſlave the world with impunity. The rod of correction is uſed for the good of children, which a loving father will exerciſe when neceſſity calls for it, to reclaim them by reaſonable puniſhment. To ſuffer a king to be a criminal without fear, is to debauch the office of a king, and debaſe royal dignity. To ſuppoſe God does it, is ſuppoſing partiality in God; thus to do, is to debaſe God, to exalt the king.

Men are made *kings* by the grace of God,—but not *tyrants*, becauſe they have not the grace of God in them. And that *grace of God* which makes kings, comes by means of the *good-will of the people*. Thoſe that hold their power by this right, as *the preſent royal family do*, have the beſt, the juſteſt, and the moſt natural right in the world. Properly ſpeaking, men are made kings by *the grace of the people*, and they behave as worthy of ſuch office, by *the grace of God*. Let thoſe that deny this, ſhew their commiſſion to be from God, and not from the people; let them plainly prove it ſo, without the ſophiſtry of prieſtcraft, that the world may believe it.

What king did ever come from heaven! that any of them ſhould preſume to claim a divine right to any kingdom on earth? Or what commiſſion was ever given from *heaven* to any man, to poſſeſs a kingdom on *earth*. The *divine right* of kings to rule over people, without, and againſt their conſent, is a *profane jeſt*; though 'tis like many other things that are called divine, which of all things have the leaſt relation to divinity. And yet nations have been ſo far deluded, and impoſed on by their teachers, by the governors and guardians of their liberties,

liberties, that they have ſuffered their natural rights, liberties and properties to be given away, by will, at the pleaſure of a departing king, like a paternal eſtate. If a king has a right to diſpoſe of the people at his death, without their conſent; why not to ſell the kingdom in his life time without their conſent, as a man has to ſell his eſtate? or to ſell his ſubjects, as cattle are ſold in the market? But if he cannot juſtly give away the kingdom at his death, nor ſell it in his life-time, without conſent of the people, then 'tis evident that the power of governing them lies in themſelves, and no man hath a right to a kingdom, as a man hath to an eſtate; but that, *the right and power of governing a nation, is in the power of the nation*, till tyranny and oppreſſions rob them of it, and render them for ever incapable of recovering their *native right:* Then farewell all that is dear and valuable to a free people.——When a whole nation become the property of a king or prieſt, or of both united to make the chain that binds them the ſtronger, who dare ſay his ſoul or body is his own? And as kingly majeſty, ſo the prieſthood is conſtituted by the people. " Whoever is declared to be a prieſt by any ſociety, is a prieſt to them; and ceaſes to be one, the moment they declare him none." —— But all pretended right that is maintained by power, force and violence, is no longer right than the foundation can ſupport it. He poſſeſſes my property, as a robber does that is ſtronger than I, and can hold it no longer than he holds his ſtrength; for when I can, it is my right to diſpoſſeſs him of his unjuſt gains.——He that would enſlave a nation, is himſelf a ſlave to ſome other perſon, or to his paſſions, and to reſtleſs ambition. He has a *weak head*, and a *wicked heart*; and if ſuperſtition and bigotry may paſs for religion, he may be a very religious man.

The

The *Scotch prince* assumed a tyrannical power over the constitution of this realm, and the consciences of men, throughout his whole reign. He endeavoured to encroach on the privileges of parliament, and to set himself *above the laws*. In these *principles* and *practices*, he was flattered and encouraged by his sycophant ministers, bishops and clergy. With these false notions of power, the son's heart was corrupted, his head was turned and overturned. Ambitious men told them, their persons and authority were *divine*, to exalt themselves thereby; they swallowed the *profane* bait, and were intoxicated with it; they reeled and staggered with licentious power like drunken men.

Whatever is *divine*, must be so in the *nature* of the thing; and if so, then such as are *by nature kings*, are kings by divine right: And such his successor seems to have been, who kept by his wisdom what he got by his valour. Nature herself could not forbear discovering her disorder, groaning for the nation, at the loss of so great a man.—But nature seemed never to design the man, whom this day has almost deified, a higher step than that of a *bishop*; nor his father, than that of a *schoolmaster*. Both father and son mistook their abilities, in conceiving themselves kings by any *natural qualification* they had for that office, or by any thing like *divine right* inherent in their persons.—To carry on this juggle since their reigns, and to deceive the populace into the *divinity* of the *Stuart family*, their successors pretended to work miracles, in curing diseases by a touch, and the bishops and clergy countenanced the fraud, and carried on the imposture. Some fools now have faith enough to believe (and when have not fools a foolish faith) that the seed of the *Stuarts* have this gift, and have been as far as *France* or *Rome* to partake of it. A sufficient demonstration of the

the *impoſition* and *ſtupidity* of that party. But truth and righteouſneſs are not ſupported by religious knavery.

Enthuſiaſm enraged is madneſs; if the perſons ſeized with it are exaſperated, they grow mad. The king was enthuſiaſt enough to believe, that he of all the nation was the *ſole favourite* of heaven. The people who had ſcrutinizing eyes, ſeeing nothing ſuperlative in him, worthy the delight of heaven or of earth, began to conceive, that if he *by the grace of God*, was God's peculiar favourite, they had as much right and title to *that grace* as he. Thus the enthuſiaſm which the prieſts had kindled in the king, began to ſpread among the people; and the wild fire being caught out of the prieſts hands, it was no longer under their direction. Every one of the Lord's people was as good as a prieſt or a king. And how indeed could it be otherwiſe, unleſs the king and prieſt had by their better doctrine and conduct taught the people better? And ſo all thought themſelves to be *kings and prieſts to God, even the lamb*, even that lamb who is convertible into a *lion*. As the king himſelf, in *his* way, was baptiſed with the fire of this enthuſiaſtic ſpirit, ſo from him the flame catched the people; his prieſts ſowed the ſeeds of it in him, and he among all the people. It begun at court, and extended over all his dominions. Such as men ſowed, they alſo reaped in full meaſure, making good the righteous ſentence of ſcripture, which ſaith, *With whatſoever meaſure ye mete, it ſhall be meaſured to you again.*

I read that, 'The bad policy of king *James* appeared in nothing more than his falling out with his parliaments. This was principally owing to his *extravagant notions of regal power*, which he carried higher than moſt of his predeceſſors, and ſo far as was inconſiſtent with a limited monarchy,

'chy, such as is the wise and happy constitution of 'England. This brought many and great inconveniences upon him; and happy had it been, if 'his only surviving son and successor *Charles* I. 'had taken warning by the imprudent management of his father; for then he might have a-'voided the rock on which he unhappily split. But 'being brought up in the same *high notions of pre-'rogative*, he trod in the same steps, nay took 'larger strides towards *arbitrary power* than even 'his father had done. By this means, the people 'that sided with the party against the court, grew 'every day more formidable, men's passions on 'both sides were heated, mutual distrust and jea-'lousy took place; and religion also mixing in the 'quarrel, the patrons of civil liberty made their 'advantage of it, till enthusiasm, which gathered 'strength from the *arbitrary proceedings of the 'court, and the severity of the hierarchy*, grew 'rampant in its turn, and overturned not only the 'hierarchy but the *monarchy* too.' This is the sum of the general history of those times, of which particular facts are but so many proofs.

These were the mismanagements of king *Charles*, his exercising an unlawful power, that is, a power to raise taxes without consent of parliament; his insulting, provoking, and falling out with them, instead of a becoming endeavour to please them, as if *majesty* consisted in *haughtiness*—never convoking them but when compelled by want, and when his wants were satisfied, suddenly adjourning or dissolving them again in a short time after their meeting; and at those times seizing some of their members; calling men to account out of parliament for what was said in it, which ought to be *the sanctuary of freedom*; and trying all the illegal ways he could to supply his need without them. *Eleven*

years

years did tyrannical power reign uncontrolled by parliament. The kings protecting and defending evil miniſters, that perſuaded him into ſuch meaſures, both abroad and at home, as were prejudicial to the nation.——His ſhewing favour to papiſts, and putting many of them into poſts of power and authority, whom all proteſtants had reaſon to dread and abhor, remembering queen *Mary*'s *burning reign.* Authoriſing archbiſhop *Laud*'s tyranny, who fined men in his high commiſſion court at his pleaſure, while the king's miniſters, by his ſole authority, did the ſame in the ſtar-chamber.—His giving men reaſon to complain by hard and unjuſt uſage, and denying them the liberty of complaint.——His raiſing an army againſt his *Scotch* ſubjects to force them to conformity and obedience to *Laud* and the liturgy. It was grievous to the king to redreſs the grievances of his ſubjects, which were often remonſtrated, and perpetually augmented; and when he ſuffered them to be redreſſed, it ſeemed to be by conſtraint, and with a deſign to renew them.——The parliament's being never able to depend on his promiſes being fulfilled, if he had power to break them.——Theſe things were the unhappy miſmanagement of that king, which in the end brought on him the hatred of the people, and his own deſtruction. And as the king took extraordinary and unprecedented ſtrides towards arbitrary power, the parliament were obliged to take extraordinary and unprecedented ſtrides to prevent his engroſſing it to the ruin of the people's properties and liberties. Though neither ſide were entirely innocent, or all their actions juſtifiable; and in ſuch confuſion of affairs, it is impoſſible they could be void of blame; yet 'tis enough if we ſee clearly which ſide was *moſt* in fault, and was the real occaſion of all the faults of the other ſide.——It appears by the general conduct

of *Charles*'s reign, that he uſed his people not *as a nurſing father does his children*, but as the Lord uſed his enemies, and made them ſuch to himſelf, for *he ruled them as with a rod of iron, and broke them to pieces as a potter's veſſel.*——The commons ſhewed their fidelity to the nation, in often entering into the conſideration of the liberties and properties of the ſubject, and of the multitude of grievances complained of by the people, as it was their duty to do, who are choſen to be guardians of their liberties; and not to be creatures of the court, or tools of dominion, to enrich themſelves and beggar the nation, but defenders of the kingdom, to redreſs an injured people from court-oppreſſions. They had a right, as it was their buſineſs to hear and examine into *grievances*, and do their endeavour to redreſs them. To whom ſhould the people ſeek redreſs in *ſuch* caſes, but to their repreſentatives? and when ſought for in a *legal* manner, it was *illegal* not to do them *juſtice*; for that is to cruſh them with *injuſtice.*——Such vile infringement of the laws were ſo often made, that the parliament then muſt have had no regard to themſelves, nor their country, not to be incenſed at it.——The ſeverities of the church and ſtate increaſed the enemies to both. I may here ſet the church before the ſtate, becauſe the ſtate was ruled by it.—Many then forſook their native country forced by the inclemency of government, for ſhelter among the ſavages of *America*, hoping to enjoy life more to their ſatisfaction abroad, in an unknown and foreign country, than what they could expect at home.

As *the duke of Buckingham* was the man to whom (at the beginning of *Charles*'s reign) the people imputed the cauſe of all their grievances, one *lieutenant Felton* undertook, at the expence of his life, to attempt the redemption of the nation, by ſtabbing the duke

to

to the heart, ſo that he fell down dead; and happy had it been, if *Felton*'s ſucceſs had been equal to his good intention, and undaunted action. Happy had it been, if the king could have learned *care* and *conduct* from it, by endeavouring to eaſe and pleaſe the people; and not by an obſtinate diſregard, or invincible ſtupidity, opened the fountain of their blood, which inevitably drew after it the loſs of his own.—Actions well deſigned, but without ſucceſs, are often blamed when men ſee the event, but not before. Many things are known to be wrong when they take a wrong turn to our expectations and deſires.——The putting *Charles* I. to death, was not eſteemed a ſin by the nation, till *Charles* II. came in: The nation did not repent of it, till then; and till then, God did not ſeem diſpleaſed with them for the action; and then the Lord was diſpleaſed, or the prieſts belyed him, as they have often done. *Charles the martyr* gives us a ſample of what many other martyrs have been, who died for their folly and obſtinacy, not for their wiſdom and goodneſs. The *mother* church has *many* ſuch martyrs in her calends; and its excuſeable for the *daughter* to have *one*.——The power that is of God is a good governing power, or a power that governs us for our good: This excites a love to God, when he puniſhes us only for our reformation, not *viſits the iniquities of the fathers on their* innocent *children*, for this prevents our loving him. The more dreadful we conceive him to be, the leſs love we have towards him.——A religious ſenſe of deity muſt needs be, that God makes, or knows the difference we make, between good and evil, and rewards or puniſhes according to the regard we have thereto. But, what is good and evil to man, is *really* and *neceſſarily* ſo to him, whether it be the ſame to God or no, and we muſt form our conduct by our ſenſe and

knowledge thereof in all things relating to ourſelves and ſociety, that is, we muſt judge, whether actions are fit or unfit, as they may be prejudicial or beneficial to ourſelves or others, by the nature and neceſſity of their circumſtances.——If we act for our own private good in oppoſition to that of the public, 'tis a vice; and ſo much the greater, as the actor is a more public perſon, or perſon entruſted with the good of the public. An action for the *public good*, is an *extenſive virtue*; and the goodneſs is greater or leſs in degree, as it more or leſs redounds to the public intereſt or advantage. This is good and true policy, and better than any bad and falſe religion. And all religion is falſe and bad that has not this true policy in it. Seeing neceſſity requires, of two evils we ſhould chuſe the leaſt; *private* good, when it comes in competition with the *public*, ſhould be made to ſubmit to it. If then taking away the life of *one man*, will redeem a *nation* from civil and inteſtine wars, he *knows nothing at all* who does not *conſider*, that *it is good one man ſhould die for the people, that the nation periſh not.*

The king's endeavour to force epiſcopal government, with the diſcipline, ceremonies, and ſervice of the church of *England*, on the *Scots* nation, ſet the *Scots* againſt him with no leſs zeal on their ſide, which produced the Solemn League and Covenant, to maintain their own mode of Religion againſt all innovations.—— Religion is a thing of that nature, that though by pretending it, nothing is more eaſy than to wheedle people out of their ſenſes, as appears by the pageantry, trumpery, idols, and breaden God of *Rome*; or though people may be brought up in what is called religion, without any ſenſe at all of right or wrong, but as they are taught, as perſecuting and burning men for conſcience

ſcience and judgment-ſake, evidently ſhew; yet neither can *Religion*, or what bears that name, bring forth the fruit of good works, which is forcibly uſhered in, and put on as a yoke with ſeverity. Reaſon may ſometimes prevail, but compulſion never, to make men abandon what they eſteem ſacred; for violence committed on the ſacred veneration men have for what they eſteem, and have been accuſtomed to eſteem *Religion*, ſtirs up their abhorrence to that violence, and turns their veneration to zeal, to enthuſiaſm, to frenzy; and then it is, men ſo irritated are fit to burn or be burnt. Whoever attemps to *fill God's houſe by compelling men to come in*, will find it the only way to *empty* it. This method, inſtead of driving any uſeful members in, will drive many out. He that endeavours to force men's conſciences, in matters not injurious to the government, has no right notion either of government or of religion: for he that ſuppreſſes an honeſt conſcience, ſuppreſſes religion. The conſcience that would injure another, is an evil conſcience; becauſe it is an injurious one; therefore a popiſh conſcience is ſuch as deſerves no toleration among proteſtants; becauſe it ſuffers papiſts not to tolerate any other than their own. If it have toleration, therefore, among proteſtants, it is more than it deſerves; and that toleration ought to be under proper reſtraints and limitations, to guard their own liberties againſt its baneful influence. It is much more ſafe to tolerate Mahometaniſm, Judaiſm, or Paganiſm, than Popery. ——A right conſcience towards God, can never injure others for conſcience-ſake. ——*Religion* is nothing elſe but *believing in, and worſhipping God, according to the dictates of conſcience*, and if it hurts no body, nor has any tendency to it, it ought to be tolerated; for not to tolerate ſuch faith and worſhip, is deſtructive

ſtructive of ſincerity and truth. And kindling a perſecution againſt it by unwarrantable oppoſition, kindles the flame of enthuſiaſm in the perſecuted. He that erects a church on the ruins of humanity, and carries a ſpiritual conqueſt over ſlaughtered conſciences, is ignorant of divine and human nature, knows nothing of religion, and is a rebel to the majeſty of heaven, which he pretends to worſhip; but 'tis the majeſty of the prieſt he really promotes and pays his adoration to.——Ceremonies are *inſignificant* as well as *indifferent* things; but he makes them *eſſential* who raiſes contentions and bloodſhed in defence of them. Such ceremonies and encroachments as are ſet up to pull down liberty, men may warrantably guard againſt and oppoſe.——Where liberty is rooted out, ſincerity is rooted out; impartial juſtice and goodneſs in ſuch a ſtate finds no place.—If God is a reaſonable nature, form or no form equally pleaſes him, for *alike ſincerity in all, muſt be alike acceptable from all*, by whatever mode, or in whatever manner the ſincerity appears; as we are told, * *The Lord ſeeth not as man ſeeth, but the Lord regardeth the heart.* And again, † *The true worſhippers worſhip the father in ſpirit and in truth.* The beſt and only beſt things pleaſe the only beſt being.——Modes and externals pleaſe the men of mode and of ſuperficial judgments.——Whatever way men uſe, which pleaſes themſelves in ſerving God, cannot diſpleaſe him; for the heart ſanctifies the action, without which all is no more than mere fantaſtic faſhion, empty ceremony, and fooliſh formality. God loves that men ſhould pleaſe themſelves in pleaſing him, if he made us, as we are told, to give *us* pleaſure and happineſs, not to encreaſe his own.——He who underſtands that *equal ſincerity* in all religions is *equally acceptable* to God, will give liberty of conſcience to all; but he that ſees it not, is religiouſly blind, and piouſly ſtupid.——He that denies

* 1 Sam. xvi. 7. † John iv. 23.

denies men liberty of conſcience, makes ſome men hypocrites, and deſtroys thoſe that cannot be ſo made. He deſtroys that ſincerity among men which is the only pure religion all the world over. Liberty of conſcience to every man to worſhip God, and endeavour to pleaſe him in the beſt manner that appears to him, is as much the divine right of every ſubject, as power is the divine right of the beſt and moſt rightful kings on earth.—What I call the worſhip of God, is, that action which concerns only God and the worſhipper, and has no relation to *meum* and *tuum*. An action which hurts no man, and which benefits no man but the worſhipper. And as God is *the God of the ſpirits of all fleſh*, he muſt have an equal regard to the ſpiritual worſhip, which is ſincerity in all.——If it was evident to all, what ſort of worſhip God loves or hates more than another, there would be ſome reaſon to value one better or worſe than another. But till that is done, or appears on good proof, all ſides have equal pretenſions in their own way.——The conſideration of man's ignorance of God, is ſufficient to humble the ſpiritual pride of the moſt conceited enthuſiaſt; for though there is not any thing in the world is more talked of, than of God, there is not any thing in the world leſs known; and the greateſt prieſts know as little of him as the meaneſt men. Therefore methinks they ſhould not preſume too much, ſeeing though they bear the name of *divines*, they are but little acquainted with *divinity*; therefore gentleneſs and moderation become all parties.

The king went to *Scotland* with an army of 20,000 men, to reduce the *Scots* to the obedience of prelatic power and common prayer. So the king firſt raiſed arms againſt his ſubjects, and taught them to ſtand up in their own defence againſt a deluge of arbitrary power. True it is, that he did

no

not uſe his army againſt the *Scots*, becauſe the *Engliſh* were not fond of aſſiſting ſuch power, the king being adviſed not to venture a battle: But if he had not intended it, why all that parade of power, and running the nation to ſuch an unneceſſary expence, when he was always in want of money? This wound was ſkinned over between the king and the *Scots* by a ſort of truce rather than peace.——The *Scots* obſtinately determined not to ſubmit to any alteration in their religion, and the king as obſtinately to make them, urged on by archbiſhop *Laud*, who managed the king's conſcience, as men manage beaſts of burden. Such ſtupid animals are kings who are inſlaved by prieſts.——The king reſolving to reduce the *Scots* by force of arms to his will, a numerous army is raiſed, but wanting money there was a neceſſity to call an *Engliſh* parliament, leſt further impoſitions ſhould further alienate the affections of the people. But the parliament when called had no deſire to aggrieve the *Scots*; but to have their own grievances redreſſed. Brave men, that would not be byaſſed by court-threats nor flatteries! and though we pray for the pardon of their ſins, it would become us more to mend our own.—This parliament not complying with the king's demands, nor he with theirs, it was diſſolved in about three weeks, and as was uſual with him, he ſent ſome of the members to priſon.——When power is in the hand of a fooliſh prince, his exerciſing it expoſes his folly. His prieſt ſhould have taught him *Solomon*'s advice *, *Be not haſty in thy ſpirit to be angry, for anger reſteth in the boſom of fools.*——Now the king prepares againſt the *Scots*, and the *Scots* againſt the king, and in the end the *Scots* had the advantage. The king is now obliged to call an *Engliſh* parliament to ſettle the diſturbed ſtate of the nation.

This

* Eccleſ. vii. 9.

This was the laſt parliament, which met in *November* 1640. And as the nation had been always oppreſſed, without being able to obtain any redreſs, and all former parliaments had been bubbled; They firſt appointed a ſelect committee to draw up a remonſtrance of all the grievances of the nation, which were numerous, but not preſented till a year after. The king well knowing what he had to expect, ſhewed great compliance in giving his aſſent to all their bills, being awed, 'tis likely, into a ſort of tractableneſs, by an army of *Scots* being in the nation.—The parliament went a great way in redreſſing the nation's grievances, and puniſhing the authors of them, which rendered them popular. Earl *Strafford* was brought to the block. The *high commiſſion-court* and *ſtar-chamber* were aboliſhed, and many great and good things were done at the beginning of this parliament. ——— But though the king ſuffered them to go on great lengths, in delivering the nation from great oppreſſions, they knew it was contrary to his natural diſpoſition; for he hated to have his authority limited by parliament, and was deſirous of nothing more than of reigning without them; therefore, though they had paſſed a bill for triennial parliaments, they could not depend upon the ſecurity of that law; for what ſecurity can law afford, from one that tramples upon law; therefore they procured the king's aſſent to their *eſtabliſhment* during their own pleaſure, and having ſo done, they carried their point in all things they undertook to tranſact.—And well knowing their power had been deſpiſed, and as it were, annulled for ſome time before, they looked with a jealous eye on all the actions of the king, and reſolved, by way of ſelf-defence, to ſtand by and protect one another, and to preſcribe due limits to that tyrannical power, which

had inſlaved the nation fifteen years before.—They knew that to make lions tame, is to fetter them, and that then, though they may ſeem tame, yet as ſoon as they ſlip their fetters, they appear to be lions ſtill. Whether the king feared thoſe he had before inſulted and irritated; for tyrannical tempers under power, or in fear, are the moſt abject; or whether he was under ſome better ſort of tuition, like *Nero* under *Seneca*, that he behaved in a tractable manner for a while; I ſhall not pretend to determine; but certain it was, they knew the man. Therefore they had a jealous eye on all his actions; and as they could never truſt him with ſafety, when he went afterwards to *Scotland*, they had as much reaſon to fear, he would contrive to bring a *Scotch* army againſt them, as he had before raiſed an *Engliſh* army againſt the *Scots*, contrary to the will of the *Engliſh* parliament and people.—Men of ſenſe and penetration have the gifts of diſcerning the ſpirits of other men, more than the imprudent and unwary can diſcern their own; and time made it appear, their miſtruſt and jealouſy was not ill-founded. The king, who was always as weak in his conduct, as he was tyrannical in temper, could no longer be reſtrained: The ſeverity and folly of his diſpoſition diſcovered itſelf, though at the moſt improper ſeaſon: For as the proverb ſays, *Muffled cats are no good mouſers.* It was now too late to begin again to attempt the ſhewing his great power when he had ſuffered his head to be ſhorn; and though *he awoke and ſaid, I will go forth as at other times, and ſhew my great ſtrength; he knew not that the Lord was departed from him*, and was now with the parliament; for the Lord is never on the ſide of *weakneſs and folly*. Undoubtedly this condeſcenſion in the king's delivering ſo much of his *regalia* to the parliament, was a proof of a weak judgment, if he was right in

in maintaining it at first so strenuously, that he always disobliged his parliaments, and would if he could have reigned without any; but if he was right in his complacency, because he saw his former error; why did he foolishly assume such authority again, in sending officers to the house of lords and commons, to seize some of their members, and to deliver articles of impeachment against them of high treason, and at the same time, by his sole authority, to send persons to seal up their doors, trunks, and papers? And why did he come himself with an armed band the next day to demand their delivering up those members? Does this look like a thorough conviction of his error? or was it only the effect of *restraining grace?* Was not this like *the dog's returning to his vomit again*, and like *the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire?* Did it not evidently shew the nature of the man, that *the old man*, the old tyrannical nature was yet in him, and that he had *not put him off with his deeds*; that he had not put on *the new man in righteousness and sincerity*, but in profession and external appearance only? Did not those clear-sighted men the commons see through him? Was not their inward jealousy confirmed and increased by this outward proof of his *unconverted state?* Had not then the commons, the guardians of the people's liberties, reason to be on their guard against all his actions? Did not they well, in withstanding such tyrannical spirit, and in sending a serjeant at arms to break open the seals, and apprehend those that put them on? for if they had not made a stand against these arbitrary proceedings, all they had done before had been to no purpose. And did they not well, to make an order, forbidding the seizing any of their members without leave of the house, authorizing all members to stand upon their guard, and all constables,

bles and other officers to assist them? For had they not done this, they had established themselves as members of parliament in vain; nay, they had not established themselves at all; for if they had left it in the king's power to apprehend any of them at his pleasure, he might have gone on, and by such repeated acts, soon demolished the parliament. No doubt but if they could have trusted the king to the *laws*, and permitted their triennial act to take place when they were dissolved, they would not have continued themselves by a *new* act; which, though it was contrary to any *former*, was however *law*; because it was agreed to by the king, lords and commons; for such agreement makes law by the constitution of this realm; and extraordinary cases may require extraordinary acts to be made: For to every new necessity a new law must be adapted, and proportioned to the exigency of the case. But if a king, or his ministers by his command, act contrary to law, it is unlawful, and they are culpable of the breach of the laws of the land.——Force must be opposed by force, and deceit may be subverted by deceit, when other methods fail, or man has not an equal guard for self-defence. Where there is good ground for jealousy, men ought always to be upon their guard, and never part with their power, when they fear being attacked; and so much the more exert themselves, as the enemy is *great* in authority. Kings that use their power to prey on the people, *Solomon* compares to *roaring lions and raging bears*; and they are not more merciful when their indignation is stirred up, and revenge is in their reach.—He that takes away a people's liberties, has a design on their properties; and their lives are next at his mercy. Let kings alone to engross power, and the property of his subjects, and their liberties and lives will follow.

follow.—If *Charles* did not graſp at this, why did he pretend peace to his parliament, and prepare for war againſt them, by ſending his queen to *Holland*, to buy up arms and ammunition, and putting the crown-jewels into her hands for that purpoſe?—Arbitrary power is what no man breathing ought to be truſted with; therefore 'tis good policy, to overturn the bad machinations that any perſon makes uſe of to obtain it: For when it is obtained by any king, there remains no remedy to any people: Seldom doth the death of the tyrant redeem them, if his heirs ſucceed, though a ſea of blood be ſpilt to recover their loſt liberty.

After this freſh provocation given the parliament, the king, perceiving how unpopular he had rendered himſelf, ſent two meſſages to them in a complying humour; telling them he would wave his proceedings againſt the ſix members, and be as careful of their privileges, as of his own life and crown: and offered a general pardon. But pardon could not be grateful, when himſelf was the aggreſſor.——Now either the parliament ſaw that this was *temporizing* and *flattery*, knowing his natural diſpoſition, or it appeared to them, he was like thoſe chriſtians that are always *ſinning and repenting*, whoſe repentance and reformation never laſt longer than the influence of the cauſe that occaſioned it. Whether of theſe ways they judg'd, his word appeared to them not to be confided in; their jealouſy was confirmed, the fire was rekindled, they judged their lives and liberties were in danger from his power, and therefore it was to be retrenched as much as poſſible. Things were now carried to that pitch, and mutual jealouſies raiſed ſo high, that the people could neither truſt the king, nor the king the people. Had they ſubmitted to the king's authority, in all probability they would have been

cruſhed

cruſhed. And the king ſeemed reſolved not to ſuffer a diminution of his *divine* power, as his courtiers and favourite prieſts perſuaded him that he was a *Divinity*; and weak heads exalted on an eminence, are always made giddy thereby. Ambitious ſpirits chuſe rather to reign in hell, than ſerve in heaven.

The ſudden ſtarts of miſchief and treachery in the king, were a good foundation of jealouſy to the parliament and people. And when will not fire increaſe fire where there is fuel? It increaſed here to a flame, till the king was burnt in the fire which himſelf had kindled: for in him was fulfilled the threatening of the Lord by the prophet *Iſaiah*, (l. 11.) *Behold all ye that kindle a fire, that compaſs yourſelves about with ſparks: that walk in the light of the fire and in the ſparks ye have kindled. This ſhall ye have of mine hand, ye ſhall lie down in ſorrow.* And ſo it came to paſs with thoſe that had kindled the fire on both ſides; and if the Lord hath executed the fierceneſs of his wrath on them already, will he do it again on us? Doth he not know when to have done? that the nation yet faſt and howl before the Lord, and rather pelt him with prayers, if I may ſo ſay, than pray with true piety; for as *Iſaiah* ſaith, lvii. 4, *Behold ye faſt for ſtrife and debate, and to ſmite with the fiſt of wickedneſs. Is this ſuch a faſt as I have choſen, a day for a man to afflict his ſoul? Wilt thou call this a faſt, and an acceptable day to the Lord?* — They faſt, pray, and preach in ſpite to their brethren; herefore *he that ſits in heaven laughs them to ſcorn, nd has them in deriſion*; therefore this *their righeouſneſs is as filthy rags*, and they ought to pray od to forgive them *the iniquity of their holy things.* he wiſe God heareth not the prayers of fools; ecauſe they are fooliſh prayers.———Not but I would

would have this droning day for ever kept, to ſhew the world the mockery of religion; how one party, pretending piety, calls on God to pardon that ſin of theirs which they never committed; while the other party that did the action, and in like circumſtances would do it again, think it was an action worthy of as much praiſe as ſtabbing *Cæſar* in the capitol. When thoſe that did the action ruled, God was not mocked by a national repentance for it, and yet in all appearance, he is not in better friendſhip with us, than he was with them, notwithſtanding all our prayers and penitence, which appear to be all in vain; ſince being *yet* continued, they have not *yet* anſwered their end, in making atonement and procuring pardon: And no wonder, for God loves not fools, nor hypocrites; and therefore wiſely rejects their fooliſh, or hypocritical humiliation. However, it is very fit and neceſſary this day ſhould be for ever kept, to remind kings that if they are deſirous of living the *life*, they may expect to die the *death* of that king which this day celebrates.

The flame which begun in *England*, burnt to the utmoſt bounds of *Scotland*, and reached even to *Ireland*, where the *Iriſh*, to make uſe of the advantage, deſtroyed 40,000 proteſtants ſettled there, by innumerable acts of barbarity; which, if only done to free themſelves from the *Engliſh* yoke, whether countenanced by the king or not. Certain it is, that he regarded not the life of his proteſtant ſubjects; but the only thing he regarded was, that he might have ſole dominion over them; to this end, he called for his forces from *Ireland*, that he might employ them againſt his parliament in *England*; whereby it's plain, he judged that the ſettling his own authority on the deſtruction of the conſtitution, was more neceſſary, than revenging the blood

blood of 40,000 proteſtants, or ſecuring *Ireland* under the dominion of the crown of *England*; and therefore, he either knew, the *Iriſh* papiſts that committed thoſe maſſacres, were his friends, and he could truſt them to ſecure *Ireland* to his obedience; or he was willing to loſe a kingdom, to have revenge of his proteſtant ſubjects. And he that thirſts for dominion by blood, or that endeavours to wade to it through a ſea of blood, deſerves a bloody reward.——In ſhort, the conſequence was, what is very natural, and in ſuch caſe will always be, that both king, courtiers, and high-flying prieſts on one ſide, and the parliament and people on the other, ſecured what power each party could for themſelves; for it was not ſafe for the parliament to truſt their perſons in the power of the king, nor did the king think it ſafe, to truſt his power with their perſons. And the ſteps that each party took, but enraged the other; which of neceſſity terminated in the utter ruin of one of them. And as in nature the ſame cauſes will always have the ſame effects; ſo the ſame circumſtances would always produce the ſame event, was the affair acted in any age or country in the world.—— It happened at the end of eight years inteſtine wars which followed, to terminate by the death of the king, and his death alone could put an end to the blood that was ſpilt on his account. And ſure it was better that *one man ſhould die for the* preſervation of the *people, than the whole nation ſhould periſh.*

If *Charles* received his royal power from God alone, it is more than any king in this world ever did. —— But *Charles* miſtook his kingdom, for *it was not of this world*; therefore he was removed out of it, to ſeek a better, for which he was doubtleſs better qualified; for I don't diſpute the Goodneſs of the *man*, but the goodneſs of the *king*; who

ſeems

ſeems to me to have been the reverſe to what ſome have ſaid of king *David*, that he was one of the *beſt of kings*, but one of the *worſt men*. Whereas on the contrary, king *Charles* who 'tis ſaid was one of the *beſt* of *men*, was one of the *worſt kings* in the world, as archbiſhop *Laud* was a very famous churchman, but a very infamous chriſtian. As for religion, 'tis certain *Charles* had enough in him to ſet up a biſhop, and a greater ſtock of *that* ſort than kings ought to have. Yet this unhappy prince deſerves our pity, as well as the nation under his government; he being ſtupidly inſtructed by the pedant, his dogmatical father, in his younger years, was ſo fitted in maturer age to receive the malignant impreſſions of his ſpiritual *Laud* and court flatterers, who ſowed thoſe ſeeds in him, that growing up, brought ruin to the nation and himſelf. And one would think, that *he being made perfect through ſufferings*, and happy before his natural time, it does not require a hundred years pennance of a whole nation, for ſending the ſoul of ſo good a man, among the ſouls of the bleſſed: And that the exchanging a mortal inglorious crown, for a crown of immortality and glory, was ſuch a ſufficient and ſatisfactory advantage to him, that he and his friends have reaſon to thank God and the nation, for ſuch happy tranſlation. And had it been done ſooner, it had ſaved the lives of thouſands more than it did. Neceſſity makes things unlawful, to be lawful. That which juſtifies war, in the defence of the rights and liberties of the people, from tyranny from abroad, will juſtify whatever meaſures neceſſity obliges people to take, to defend their rights and liberties againſt tyrants at home. But no man's liberty or property is now at all invaded, every man *ſits under his own vine, and under his own fig-tree*; enjoys the fruits of his labour, and may worſhip God ac-

cording to his conſcience, if he has any good conſcience at all; if his conſcience don't miſ-lead him to overturn the ſtate, and the conſciences of all thoſe that are led by more reaſon and humanity than himſelf.

In all probability, the preſbyterians would not have attempted to overturn the epiſcopal church, if that church, when governed by archbiſhop *Laud*, had not endeavoured to overturn them. It muſt be owned, the church was the aggreſſor, or his tyrannical behaviour over them in it, which had the favour and protection of ſovereign power. As both king and pontif confederated together, and encouraged each other, to humble and demoliſh the power and liberty of nonconformiſts, both civil and religious; what was more natural, than for them to ſtand up in their own defence, to graſp that power which was capable of defending them againſt both civil and religious tyranny: And when they had graſped it, to uſe it as a ſcourge on their adverſaries, and pay them in their own coin by way of retaliation? Men may talk what they will, that religion being the ſubject of the quarrel, by the principles of that religion they ought not to have gone ſuch lengths as they did; the laws of religion will always ſubſide when they are againſt the laws of nature, as ſoon as nature has power to prevail; and they will find reaſons to comprehend the laws of retaliation in their religion, which before appeared oppoſite to it. For though the doctrine of *loving our enemies* may be preached, and embraced in ſentiments when men have no enemies, or may ſeem to be embraced and practiced, when retaliation is out of their power; yet when the power is turned, the tables are turned; when wrath prompts opportunity to action, then you ſhall hear another ſort of religious doctrine maintained by the aſcendant party;

ty; then the *vengeance of the Lord of hosts* is to be executed to maintain his *honour*. Then you find it commanded, * *Reward her even as she has rewarded you*; nay more, *double unto her double according to her works: In the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double*, then *torment and sorrow, plagues, death, famine, and fire*, follow to the conquered party. And this gives joy to the conquerors. Thus it ever was, and thus it will ever be; men's passions will direct men's conduct, as policy and power give liberty to their actions.—Tho' revenge is not always laudable, yet it is generally justifiable, because necessary to awe men in power, not to exercise their power tyrannically and wickedly. Retaliation of injuries, not exceeding measure for measure, are therefore just, needful, and proper to be executed, being that chiefly which awes the wicked, and keeps men within the bounds of duty or moral behaviour. If I allow that christians, as such, ought not to revenge injuries done them, yet it must be allowed too, that christians are men, no more divested of human passions than others, and those passions have the same influence, on the same occasions, over christians as over other men; therefore they, in such cases, will act as other men, even as *heretics* and *infidels* do; for when was it known that ever they did otherwise? I don't think there is an *infidel*, *deist* or *atheist* in the world would burn a man for his religion, but if they were burnt by people of any religion; as soon as they had it in their power, they would destroy the power of that religion; and reason just, and practice good. And these, (if they feared not God) would be as obedient to a mild and merciful king that acted for his subjects good, as any subjects the king had; but if like *Satan* on *Job*, he put forth his hand to destroy their

 properties,

* Rev. xviii. 6.

properties, and their liberties, and torment their fleſh, they would be as fit to rebel, and as zealous in the cauſe as other men, that are prompted on to action by the fury or enthuſiaſm of religion. And all men, religious or not religious, will do the ſame when excited by *oppreſſion*, which *makes a wiſe man mad.*

He that redeems men from tyrannic power, and brings liberty and peace to an enſlaved nation, even tho' it is but already begun, and a certain proſpect of it appears; he that from ſuch a ſtate, frees a kingdom by his virtue and valour, is *by nature a king*, and *born to reign*, therefore has in himſelf *divine right* from God, his actions are a ſufficient proof of it; and that ſlaviſh religion which is a friend to arbitrary power in the prince and prieſt, in any nation, is inimical and injurious to the peace and happineſs of mankind. And ſuch religion ſhould be kept in a ſtate of ſubjection, whoſe leaders and abettors are promoters of ſlavery in civil and religious government. Both civil and religious tyrants are ſuch faſt friends to each other, that they cannot well be ſeparated; they riſe and fall together.

One may generally know the *goodneſs* of men's religion, by the ſpirit that maintains it; for the worſt opinions are generally maintained with the worſt ſpirit by thoſe that embrace them. And it is no wonder, if ſtupid principles or frantic opinions, ſhould have ſtupid or frantic effects in practice. *By their fruits ye ſhall know them.*———That religion which teaches men to damn and burn thoſe that cannot embrace it, ought to be condemned by all men. Better would it be for mankind, than maintain ſuch religion, to extirpate all religion out of the world. It is more to the honour of God, to ſay he requires no worſhip of us, than ſuch a worſhip as makes man inhuman, and the world miſera-

ble.

ble. What is it but religious madneſs to affirm, that all men will be damned who are not of this or that faith, or who do not conform to this or that church diſcipline, or ſort of worſhip? For ſeeing theſe all damn one another, don't they all prove themſelves to be mad? Needs there a greater proof, when neither party will be directed by cool reaſon, which alone can cure their madneſs? The furious and bigotted ſpirit is equally bad in all religions; it is the ſpirit of popery in them all, which nothing but time and reaſon can expel.—Anger and rage on one ſide, breeds anger and rage on the other, ſo does a perſecuting ſpirit in a church, ſtir up the ſame ſpirit in that which is perſecuted. Theſe who are firſt in the quarrel, are the cauſe of the effect that follows. If the preſbyterians perſecuted the epiſcopal church, it was a ſign of a bad ſpirit, but it was firſt ſtirred up by the epiſcopalians; they were firſt, and therefore greateſt in fault; though nothing is more common than to lay the *whole blame* on the provoked, not on thoſe that gave the provocation; and yet nothing is more wrong, for it is as natural for anger, indignation, and reſentment, to ariſe from oppreſſion, abuſe, and injury given, as for fire to kindle fire; and men muſt be devoid of paſſion to be otherwiſe, which is more than any men are. Therefore to the public peace-breakers all the conſequences of the public diſturbance are owing.

O! cry churchmen, the preſbyterians are a pack of wicked rogues, they pulled down the church! Nay, ſay I, not ſo; for they poſſeſſed themſelves of the churches, and ſo became churchmen. But the church-folk pulled down the meeting-houſes, in *my time*, and would have pulled down all in the nation, if they had not been ſtopped by force. Was not this religious high-church frenzy and fanaticiſm? though this very party called the other fanatics!

So

So madmen know not their own madneſs, and think others mad: But the churchmen, to have been even with the Nonconformiſts, inſtead of pulling down their meeting-houſes, ſhould have gone and preached in them. The preſbyterians indeed pulled down the common prayer, becauſe God ſhould not be on the ſide of the church; for if they did not pray, to be ſure the Lord could not hear them, and they could not pray without book, and at the ſame time the preſbyterians themſelves pray'd for dear life—and liberty to pray. But ſuppoſe they did pull down the church, was not the church as bad which would have pulled down the preſbyterians at the ſame time? They wanted not will, but power. I don't ſuppoſe any nonconformiſts would have had any intention or thought of robbing the church of her biſhops and godly gear, if archbiſhop *Laud* had been a good man, and not, like a wolf in ſheep's cloathing, have worried Chriſt's ſheep in his ſpiritual courts. No doubt but the church might have *droned* in peace, had ſhe let her ſiſter church *toned* in peace. But at the end, the fortune of war turned for the diſſenting party, and whatever party loſe the day, they muſt be at the mercy of thoſe that get it. Thoſe that fall undermoſt muſt ſubmit to them that get uppermoſt. What was the fate of the epiſcopalians and common prayer-mongers, would have been the fate of the preſbyterians, had they loſt the field. But they fought with the ſpirit, as well as pray'd by the ſpirit; and it happened at that time *to help their infirmities.* Indeed, in my opinion, it is the faireſt way of living to live and let live, not to have any buſineſs monopolized. Religion, like Trade, ought to be free. It is beſt dealing at an open market; by that means we have a more reaſonable choice, and at a more reaſonable rate. When you have only *Hobſon*'s choice, you muſt

pay

pay *Hobſon*'s price. Parſons, when they find people can by no means help themſelves, but muſt deal with them alone, are as great extortioners as any pawnbrokers whatever. Why ſhould not every man chuſe for himſelf in ſpirituals, as well as in temporals, and buy thoſe wares he likes beſt, or thinks he has moſt need of, ſeeing he muſt pay for them. Religion is a thing of choice, and he has no religion, that never choſe any himſelf, for himſelf; but if he ſeems to have any, it is the religion of another he puts on, but not his own. It was the religion of the perſon that firſt choſe it, but is not his that wears it, and that perſon might, perhaps, be his great grandfather's great grandmother; and it may have been, of a very different faſhion from his, worn in the family till it becomes quite thread-bare. Many families have religion by *hereditary right*, and this they take to be *divine*, but if it was ſo, it would be by *election* and *grace*, both on the ſide of Chriſt and the Chriſtian. Let either of them chuſe firſt, they muſt *both* chuſe; or elſe neither does the profeſſor chuſe Chriſt, nor Chriſt the profeſſor. Therefore, in the day of judgment, will not Chriſt ſay to ſuch, *Depart from me, I know you not*; and the profeſſor, if he ſpeaks the truth, muſt anſwer, *Nor do I know you.* What will become of theſe in that day, the day muſt declare.—But ſhould any be ſo honeſt (for in that day men may be allowed to ſpeak the truth) as to ſay, the prieſts of his country would not let him chuſe, for they would damn him if he did. And I ſuppoſe this will be the complaint of millions. Let the prieſts look to it. I think it is but juſt that they ſhould be damn'd for 'em. If any had liberty to chuſe for himſelf, but depended on the prieſt to chuſe for him; how can he think it unjuſt, that the prieſt ſhould be ſaved for him. But as prieſts i

all ſuch caſes, chuſe for others what is moſt conſiſtent with their own intereſt, they are paid *here*, therefore it is unreaſonable for them to expect to be paid again *hereafter:* Therefore both theſe we may reckon the Lord's chaff, which he will winnow from him with the fan of his word.——And ſuppoſe one is called to the bar, who, upon being aſked his religion, declares upon his conſcience, that as he lived in ſuch days of fury, wherein every religious party damned each other, for fear of being damned (by all the reſt) he choſe none; and not thinking it ſafe to depend on mercenary prieſts, thought it better to preſerve an honeſt conſcience, and to place his whole dependence on the *merits of the ſon*, or the *mercies of the father only*. Will not the *ſon* or the *father* take pity of him, think you, and ſave him for his honeſty and fidelity, if not for faith and formality-ſake? God cannot condemn a juſt man, and be juſt himſelf. But he whoſe faith and worſhip makes him inhuman and injurious to men, miſtakes the true God for *Moloch*, or *Maſs*, and he that makes his *intereſt* the motive of his choice, inſtead of ſerving the God of Heaven, he ſerves the god of this world, *worldly power*, and a *worldly diſpoſition*. Men that will not do juſtice here, will ſurely there feel juſtice done them, for the Devil is juſt in his own dominions; how elſe can he be the executioner of juſtice? And there muſt be juſtice in hell, if there is mercy in heaven.

Nothing I think ſhews more the government of a good God, or his regard of this world, than that great criminals armed with power receive condign puniſhment in it; for what they receive in another world, thoſe in this, know nothing of: Therefore God's conduct in *that world*, is no proof to us of his moral character in *this*. Certainly power and greatneſs cannot ſanctify wickedneſs in high places.

If it be criminal to condemn *great criminals*, juſtice is all a farce, and power is only right, whether it be executed rightly or no; and power is ſacred in them that have it, howſoever it be profanely uſed, and impiouſly proſtituted for the ſcreening villainy, and the worſt of all villainy that of *tyranny*. *Cæſar* was a *tyrant*, becauſe he overturned the conſtitution of his country. *Charles* did not this, becauſe he could not; but he endeavoured to reduce the ſtate into an abſolute monarchy. *Cæſar* knew how to procure to himſelf favourable opportunities, and make the beſt uſe of them. *Charles* knew neither. *Cæſar* warred with glory, but *Charles* was inglorious in all his wars, and never ſhewed more bravery than when it leaſt became him, in the unneceſſary war he raiſed againſt his own ſubjects. In one reſpect they may be compared together; 'when we 'reflect upon the prodigious number of men, whoſe 'death, poverty, or ſlavery they occaſioned, we 'can hardly forbear abhorring them. Their '*falſhood* and *ambition* brought on a *civil war*. 'They uſed the arms of their country for the op-'preſſion of their country.' The people indeed in *Rome* and *Britain* did not tamely ſubmit: Therefore they that made the noble ſtand for the liberty of free-born ſubjects in oppoſition to *tyranny*, are damned by their favourites and prieſts, who endeavoured to inſlave mankind by their wicked counſels and doctrines, and lead weak heads to their own undoing. Had it not been for their ambition to rule as they ought not, both might have *lived and died in peace*. He that makes a prince's head giddy with unlawful power, paves the way for his deſtruction.

We blame that age, but not our own. They put a bad king to death. We expell'd another, not killed him; becauſe his Heels ſaved his Head. But we

do worſe than they, when we blame our redeemer, the ILLUSTRIOUS *WILLIAM, for the action of redeeming us, and ſettling liberty on that glorious foundation on which it now ſtands.* We were again redeemed by the bravery and conduct of another *WILLIAM*, from ſlavery rolling on like a deluge, and him, and that very glory which freed the nation, we now depreciate. They cut off a *head* that was troubleſome to the *body*; we have ſeveral times rebelled againſt our head, in which *the life, ſafety, and health of the body depends*, againſt thoſe that have ſettled and ſecured thoſe civil and religious liberties to us, which they prayed and fought for; and is deſirable and acceptable to all wiſe and good men, in all nations and in all ages. O let this day be for ever kept, to perpetuate the infamy of his tyrannic reign, and the holineſs and power of high church, that it is capable of making one, who was ſo great a ſinner in his life, ſo glorious a ſaint and martyr at his death; conſecrating not only the man, but tyranny, oppreſſion, and bigotry; and that generations yet unborn may know the hard and bloody ſtruggle their anceſtors had to preſerve the liberty they have conveyed to them, and awake to the ſenſe of its ineſtimable value. And whenever they are in like danger of loſing it, let them cry unto the Lord, and ſay in the words of his prophet of old, * *Awake, awake, put on ſtrength, O arm of the Lord; awake as in the ancient days, in the generations of old. Art not thou the ſame arm that haſt wounded the proud, and hewn the dragon in pieces?*

It can't be denied, that actions are known to be good or evil by the intentions and conſequences. Now

* Iſaiah li. 9. So the old tranſlation renders the latter part of the verſe.

Now to judge by this maxim, the putting king *Charles* to death, being intended to put an end to civil wars, and the conſequence was, that it did ſo, and prevented the death of many men, and valuable members of the commonwealth, every one of which could not be leſs uſeful to the public, than the king. For how could he be uſeful to the public, who deſtroyed the peace, properties, and lives of the public ?——If he was a king appointed by God, he was ſuch a king over this iſland, as the ſtork was, which devoured the frogs, whom *Jupiter* ſent to rule over them.—To plead or pretend, that it is for men's *ſins*, ſuch kings are commiſſioned by heaven to rule over them, is an ignorant ſubterfuge ; for do they make men *leſs ſinful*, and not rather much *greater ſinners* than they were before ? unleſs *robbery* and *murder*, the neceſſary conſequences of war, are no ſins. Does God puniſh ſin with ſin ? or does ſin make an atonement for ſin ? if ſo, a leſs degree of ſin diſpleaſes God, but a greater degree propitiates him. Or does God diſapprove of ſome ſort of ſins, and approve of others ? If he does, it may be hoped, that the ſin of putting king *Charles* to death, might atone for the ſins of the king, and of the nation committed on his account, as reaſonably as the ſin of putting Chriſt to death, atoned for the ſins of men. Is heaven more pleaſed with earth when ſet in a tumult, or is there ſometimes a diſorder in the divine mind, and allayed by the diſorder of mankind ? This, as my reaſon informs me, is a falſe and ſtupid imagination. Does God regard men in ſuch degree, as they are advanced to power and dignity by men ? Is *his* judgment conducted by *ours* in the eſtimation of things ? I am ſure, if God exalts men in and over the ſtate, according to the value he has for them, *our* judgments are not conducted by *his*.——Kings

reign

reign by divine right, when they reign as they ought; but to say they reign by divine right, when they trample upon right divine, upon law and justice, and reign as they ought not, is a sacrilegious doctrine, and profaning, if not blaspheming, divine nature. If the persons of kings are divine, and sacred in the sight of God, let them rule as they will, then power is divinity, and authority is sanctity; and lawless sway may be lawful government; then the office of a king is not an ordination for the public good, but the public were ordained for his good, and then to be sure, God makes the people for the sake of the king; and his life alone, is of more value than the lives of all the kingdom. If so, what the high priest spake, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, is not true, that *it is better one man die, than the nation perish.* If this was true when applied to Christ, one would think, as *Charles* was not, to be sure, so good a man, it was better, at least to the people of this land, for *their temporal state*, that their sovereign *Charles* should die to save the further effusion of the nation's blood, and their liberty, than that the Lord *Christ* should die to save the temporal state of the *Jews*, which was all that *Caiaphas* meant, though the Holy Ghost might have a further meaning. If God only regards kings, and the good of the people are below his notice, as must be the case, if the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance be right; then are the people in evil case! in evil case no doubt! But this is contrary to what we are taught, that *God is no respecter of persons*, and if *a sparrow cannot fall to the ground* without his notice, and we are *better than they*, in his sight; if *he takes care of oxen only for our sakes* †, sure we ought to take care of being gored, for our own sakes, by any

† 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10.

any perſon armed with power, or claiming a power over us. 'Tis reaſonable to think that thoſe to whom God has a peculiar regard to, more than to other men, he has given them ſome *greater endowments* of body or mind, more than he has to other men; but if nothing of this appears in them, how does the proof of it appear? It ſeems alſo reaſonable to believe, that God guards his peculiar favourites in a peculiar manner, and yet what king cares to truſt himſelf to God's guard only, if he can get other guard beſide?—That this *divine right* ſhould be *indefeaſible* and *hereditary* too, is ſuch a piece of *prieſtcrrft* and *impoſition* on the common underſtandings of men, that there is no man of any common underſtanding, but what muſt ſee the folly, abſurdity, and villainy of it. Let them produce the original grant, warrant, commiſſion, or indenture, written above, ſigned and ſealed below and the witneſſes. 'Tis not fit we ſhould take the prieſt's word, who aſſerts what he is ignorant of, or contrary to what he knows: He that does, will be a prieſt-rid with a witneſs; it being an evident witneſs of prieſtly impoſition. Or to prove that any *particular line* of princes are ſo eminently exalted above the reſt of all mankind, to have their authority from God alone; ſure they ought to be proved to be deſcendants from above, that the firſt of the race came down from heaven, or was begotten by ſome God originally, not an *imaginary* but a real *God*, not *Jove* or *Mars*, whoſe Godſhips are now dead and buried; and that the breed has not degenerated down to manhood. Let the aſſertors of this doctrine alſo prove that the *Stuart* race are of this heavenborn blood; for I think they have never conferred that *honour* on any other family, nor preached the doctrine of *paſſive obedience* to any other princes, *honour* peculiarly great to *them* of all others; becauſe *they* of all others deſerved it ſo little! This is

t

they have to prove, and if they cannot prove this *one* thing, of *their indefeasible hereditary right*, who have asserted it with so much warmth, casting about *fire-brands, arrows, and death* to support and vindicate it, and therefore ought to have been very sure, they were very right in doing so. I say, if they cannot prove this, who can believe them in any other point, or, who ought to believe them without producing their authentic credentials?

He that suffers such doctrines to be preached *to* him, or *of* him, has a *mean head*, and a *monstrous heart*; for he must be a man of *mean* judgment, and a *monster* in the judgment of other men that have understanding. — If we go to scripture for our rule, God gave to *David* and to his descendants the kingdom of *Israel* by oath, and yet God chose rather, not to insist too strictly on the performance of his oath, than disoblige his people. Nay, God gave up *his own prerogative* rather than *their liberty*. He let them have a *king* to their mind, and let the king have a *God* to his mind. God himself did not force men to worship him contrary to their own inclinations. If therefore any officious set of men pretend to regard men's service of God, more than God regards men's service, it is for their own sake they make those pretensions, and shew of zeal for God, in an ungodly manner. And why should any earthly king insist on his prerogative, more than the king of kings insists on his; seeing * *in times past he suffered all nations to walk in their own ways*. God surely knows better, what he has to do, and how to do his will, than man does. If man can serve God better than God can serve himself, God may be obliged to man for serving him; but if God cannot be obliged by man's service, man can only serve himself in serving God.—But what God gave the kingdom of *Israel* to *David*, and his

* Acts xiv. 16.

his ſons, by *divine hereditary right*, what's that to us? How came the tranſition from *Iſrael* to *England*, and from *David* to *Stuart?* Our conſtitution of government is as different from theirs, as that people, time, and place are different from ours. They had *prophets* that knew the will of God, and received their revelation from him; but our *prieſts* know no more of the will and revelation of God, than we do; for they know no more of it than what they read, and we know as much, and underſtand it as well. Beſides, *the goſpel gives no rule about national government*; therefore God leaves all *chriſtian* nations *to walk in their own ways*, as he did the nations *in time paſt*. Therefore it is not the buſineſs of chriſtian prieſts to direct chriſtian governors; 'tis impertinent in them to preſcribe or meddle in ſtate-matters, unleſs their aſſiſtance or advice is called for, or commanded by the ſtate. And as *Chriſt's kingdom was* evidently *not of this world*, what have they to do to interfere and concern themſelves with worldly kingdoms and affairs. Chriſt came to ſet us free, and is it their buſineſs, who profeſs to be his ſervants, to inſlave us? It is both ridiculous and inſolent, for the ſervant to pretend to have more authority than the maſter: *The ſervant is not greater than his Lord.* How then can thoſe who call themſelves Chriſt's miniſters, pretend to worldly power and anthority, when their maſter had none, *had not where to lay his head.* Were they to have no wages, but what their maſter Chriſt is to give them, there would be very few but what would quit his ſervice; though thoſe Chriſt ſends, he will no doubt reward. They that pretend to have their miſſion from him, not from the ſtate or the people, and therefore claim civil dominion, claim what their maſter never did, ſhould have no reward, but ſuch as he thinks fit to give them, from whom they pretend to be ſent: For

this

this very good reaſon, becauſe they aſſume a tyrannical authority over thoſe on whom they are dependents for their livings, and who pay them their wages; eſpecially when humility and obedience to lawful kings and magiſtrates is their lawful and juſt duty, that they may, by their example, teach men to lead *quiet and peaceable lives in all godlineſs and honeſty*. Their doctrine and behaviour ought to be ſuch, as may bring *glory to God, peace on earth, and good-will to men*. This is *goſpel*; and this is the buſineſs of the *miniſters of the goſpel*. They ought not to *lord it over god's heritage*. Their duty is not to rule, but to obey; not to uſe force and violence, but meekneſs and inſtruction; both in life and doctrine promoting righteouſneſs.

Be it known to all kings and princes, that thoſe who preach unlimited obedience to them, do it for ſome baſe end; but will practice it no more than thoſe that maintain oppoſition in ſome caſes to be lawful and juſt, for there is no ſuch obedience in man's nature; they preach a doctrine unnatural which cannot be practiced, and therefore will be no more regarded by them than by others: For ſuch doctrines of religion as are againſt nature, whatever gloſs may be put upon them, cannot, and will not be obeyed; and are therefore arbitrary, tyrannical, and unjuſt. Religion ſhould reſtrain and regulate men's paſſions, not preſume to crucify or extirpate them; for that is a preſumptuous aiming to make men other creatures than ever God deſigned them; therefore ſuch aims are equally ſtupid and wicked. Should any king put forth his hand to oppreſs the clergy, as king *Charles* oppreſſed his ſubjects, and *Laud* the laity; the clergy will be as ready as any other men to blow *the trumpet of ſedition, and the alarm of war*; nor will they be content with bare exerciſing their ſpiritual terrors in the

next world, and suffering in this. The *battle* will be the *Lord's* of whatever regiment in religion the clergy be; and I have always observed, that the most zealous assertors of passive obedience, have been men of the most resisting and turbulent tempers. That they love tyranny, is very apparent, because they always promote it; and always deify that king who deifies them; who gives his power and dominion to them; though by his actions he be apparently *the vilest of men:* Which shews, in the most glaring light, their extreme partiality, being always ready to sanctify and applaud whatever men or measures contribute to their advantage, to heap on them wealth and dominion, though they are of the darkest hue that moral characters can represent.

God who for the good of man, *spared not his own son*, for the good of the kingdom, spared not the king; esteeming it *better that one man should die for the people, than the nation perish.* Nor does it appear to me that the one was less necessary in the different nature and reason of the thing than the other. For had the nation submitted to the king's will, it had, in all peradventure, remained enslaved at this day; for when his vengeance had been irritated by opposition, in all probability there would have been no end, till tyranny had established its seat by blood, and popery by fire. But what if the church had not subjected to the pope at *Rome*, if it erected a pope at *Canterbury*, would that have mended the matter? What if it had not all the popish trumpery and ceremonies, if it had her tyranny and cruelty, how would the matter have been mended? His grace of *Canterbury* was graciously pleased to declare, that *he hoped to see the time when never a Jack gentleman in* England *should dare to stand with his hat on before the meanest priest.* This was suffi-

cient to ſhew, that he drove at making every gentleman ſervile and ſubmiſſive to every mean ſpiritual tyrant, and that he hoped to make all prieſts rampant in power.

Though I may have ſeemed to have treated the divine right of king *Charles* without divine homage or veneration, yet if we conſider rightly of the matter, there was a ſort of *Athanaſian divinity*, ſomething like *trinity in unity* in the family; for ſuch as *Charles* was, ſuch was the *father James*, and ſuch was *James* the *ſon*, in majeſtic prerogative co-equal, in religion co-external. As was the tree, ſuch was the fruit. And as we found the fruit naught, we contradict ourſelves to mourn over the tree, as if it had been good, which there was judged to be a neceſſity to cut down. Our fathers began the ſtruggle for liberty againſt an arbitrary family, and we finiſhed it with glory. Can that which is glorious in us, be inglorious in them? They, for the peace and ſecurity of the ſtate, cut off the head of the father; we, for the ſame reaſon, cut off the tail of the ſon; though it had been better for us if we had cut off his head alſo. But thus was the judgment of God executed upon *them*, that he might have mercy upon *us*; for his judgments are always mixt with mercy. Such judgments the Lord threatened to his *Iſrael* of old, * *The Lord will cut off from* Iſrael *head and tail, branch and ruſh in one day.*

If we may judge of men's diſpoſitions by their actions, if the tree be known by its fruit, this prince was doubtleſs weak in his judgment, obſtinate, and vindictive in his temper, and very inſincere as hypocrites are; and therefore no wonder if he affected to be thought religious, and ſo fond of ignorant devotion and religious ceremonies, that he became a ſlave to prieſts; and endeavoured, as tutored by them,

* Iſaiah ix. 14.

them, to inſlave the people. Though it muſt be confeſſed, the king had a conſcience, and a very great one; for when he had to do with the conſciences of others that were different from his, it ſwallowed them all up, as *Aaron*'s rod ſwallowed up the rods of the *Egyptian* Magi. And 'tis well known, that the rod of the prieſt's power always endeavours to ſwallow up all other power, and often does ſo.——In *Charle*'s younger years he was looked on by all that knew him to be of a very obſtinate diſpoſition, which his mother much lamented; and publickly confeſſed, that *ſhe feared he would live to be the ruin of himſelf, and occaſion the loſs of the three kingdoms by his obſtinacy.*——If any thing hindred him from being a papiſt, it was his love of *prerogative*; for notwithſtanding the ſtrictneſs of the laws againſt papiſts at the beginning of his reign, he granted them a general pardon and indulgence; and declared, *it was his will that all the laws againſt them ſhould ſtand diſcharged.* Thus he early diſcovered himſelf a friend to popery and tyranny.—And as the king and prieſthood graſped at abſolute authority, and increaſed in the exerciſe of it over the People, ſo the dire effects of their tyranny and cruelty increaſed. Their new-invented and erected High Commiſſion Courts and Star-chamber were nearly related to popiſh Inquiſition, by which monſtrous cruelties were committed, and prodigious fines impoſed on great numbers of perſons, ſome of whom were men of the beſt reputation, parts and learning, of which it may not be improper to give a ſample, whereby to judge of others.

Mr. *Prynne*, for reflecting on the court and archbiſhop *Laud* in his writings, was proſecuted in the Star-chamber, and ſentenced to pay 5000*l.* to the king, to ſtand twice in the pillory, to have both his ears cut off, one at each time, to be afterwards im-

priſoned during pleaſure without uſe of pen, ink or paper, and to be ſtigmatized on both cheeks with S L denoting a Seditious Libeller.

Two or three years after, the ſame *Prynne*, and *Baſtwick*, and *Burton*, for writing ſome reflections on the hierarchy and government, were ſentenced to pay 5000*l.* each to the king, to ſtand in the pillory, to have their ears cut off, and *Prynne* that part of his ears which were left.

Mr. *John Lilbourne* for writing in Mr. *Prynne*'s vindication, was condemned by archbiſhop *Laud* in his Star-chamber to be whipt with a treble-knotted cord from the *Fleet* priſon to *Weſtminſter-hall*, and had 500 laſhes. Afterwards in this deplorable and bloody condition he was obliged to ſtand in the pillory, and was there gagged for complaining of this cruel and barbarous uſage.

Dr. *Leighton* for offending the hierarchy, was ſentenced to pay 10,000*l.* to the king, and by two of *Laud*'s Officers was hurried into a moſt diſmal cell in *Newgate*, there kept almoſt two days without food, and his effects ſeized, received when very ill thirty-ſix ſtripes with a treble cord, afterwards ſtood in the pillory all bloody as he was almoſt two hours in a time of froſt and ſnow, had there one ear cut off, one noſtril ſlit, and one of his cheeks branded with a red hot iron, then carried away to the *Fleet* priſon again by water; and that day ſevennight the ſores on his back, noſe, and face not being cured, he was again whipt and pillored in *Cheapſide*, and there had the remainder of the ſentence executed, by cutting off the other ear, ſlitting up the other noſtril, and branding the other cheek.

Innumerable were the torments and troubles of the ſubjects, in the reign of this *pious king*. And where-ever the clergy reign, or a bigotted prince, they damn the laity, that is, they make them damned

damned *ſlaves* or *villains:* and if they drive them to heaven, it is through hell. None ſacrifice to *mammon* more devoutly than they. When tyranny is intended to be eſtabliſhed, it is the work of mercenary prieſts to begin the ſalley againſt common ſenſe: the better to bubble, bully, and inſlave the people, the terrors of domnation are of ſacred uſe: by theſe they endeavour as much as in them lies to annul all the laws that ſecure to the people their rights and properties. Laws cannot poſſibly be of any ſervice, if they may not be defended, againſt a powerful robber and perverter of them. Or againſt a band of men combined to rob the nation of their properties and privileges, which are as much their right, as what the king holds by law is his, becauſe both hold them by the ſame rightful power, the law of the nation; and therefore ſubjects have equal right to poſſeſs and defend, what the law gives them, as the ſovereign has. NOTHING IS MORE SACRED THAN LAW; it is the power of wiſdom and goodneſs, or both, united for a good end, and is called JUSTICE. *It is Juſtice that is Law.* Juſtice is the proper ruling power, not the power of the ruler; for power is given to a ruler, to a political head, for the ſake of maintaining juſtice. To tranſgreſs the law, is a criminal thing; it is doing what is not juſt, and therefore renders the tranſgreſſor criminal, and a unjuſt perſon, whoever he be; for the Law is like God, which is God's Law, it is *no reſpecter of perſons*; and the law of nature is the nature of the law. When the political head therefore is become unjuſt, it is unnatural to the body politic, and offends it; ought not then the goſpel precept to be practiſed, which ſays * *If thy right eye, right hand* (or principal member) *offend thee, cut it off, and*

c

* Matthew vi. 29, 30.

caſt it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members periſh, rather than the whole body; for deſperate diſeaſes muſt have deſperate remedies; though it ought not to be in the power of pope, prieſt, enthuſiaſt, or any private, particular perſon, to determine the public particular caſe; but t reſides in the united power of the public body, rom which the head received its power of being ead, for the united good of the body, or the public. For this reaſon, they confer their power on ne perſon, and veſt their authority in him, not or his good in oppoſition to theirs, but for their wn good in conjunction with his. Conſidering he end and intention of their action, it is a power *nt*, not given; it is their power who are the *nders*, and they are the body who have it in themlves by *natural* right, that is, and that only is *ivine*; and he that receives it from them, has it y the ſame right; but has no right to poſſeſs or ecute it longer than he rightfully uſes it. He that as loſt his conduct cannot be a conductor. Of him at perverts what is lent him, to his own uſe, in ejudice to the lender; certainly the lender has a ght to demand the reſtoration of what he lent, d oblige him to it by force, and foul means, when ir means fail. No law can bind men down *for tter for worſe, till death*, if they are aggrieved, d can find a remedy, no more in political, than in yſical caſes. No laws of God or nature oblige y perſon or people to remain miſerable if they can freed from miſery, and make themſelves happy. o expel or kill a governor, undoubtedly puts a tion into convulſions; but when his *life* puts a tion into convulſions, then his expulſion or death the only remedy. When a diſeaſe is bad, the re is good. If the remedy is worſe than the die, we muſt ſeek another; but ſome caſes admit

of

of but one remedy, one method of cure, and in thoſe caſes that muſt be had, or none. Let the remedy be what it will, it is not the leſs good becauſe it is public; nor is juſtice the leſs juſtice, becauſe it is done in a juſticiary way.— To extort money from a nation contrary to law, is national plunder, and public rapine. And we all know what puniſhment the law pronounces on highway-robbers. Do they who rob a whole nation deſerve leſs puniſhment than thoſe who rob only ſingle perſons? or ought great criminals to eſcape with impunity, and little criminals only ſuffer. Or in deſperate caſes, *is it not expedient that one man die for the people, that the nation periſh not?*

Mr. *Gordon*, that Herculean reaſoner, in his Diſcourſes on *Tacitus* *, ſays, 'An abſolute prince is of all others the moſt inſecure, as he proceeds by no rule of law, he can have no rule of ſafety; he acts by violence, and violence is the only remedy againſt him. His acts of cruelty upon particulars, whether done for revenge or prevention, do but alarm other particulars to ſave themſelves by deſtroying him.

† It is as rare for a prince limited by laws, and content with his power, to reign in ſorrow, or die tragically, as it is uncommon for thoſe who have no bounds ſet them, or will ſuffer none, to eſcape a miſerable reign and unbloody end.

‖ The people likewiſe expect complaiſance from a prince, expect to have their ſentiments and humours conſidered; while the prince probably thinks that they have no right to form any judgment of public matters, or to make any demands upon him, but on the contrary requires of them blind reverence and obedience to his authority; and acquieſcence in his ſuperior conduct and ſkill, that all his doings ſhoud paſs for juſt; himſelf for a perſon altogether

* Vol. I. p. 106. † p. 111. ‖ p. 123.

gether ſacred and unaccountable; and his words for laws. If their behaviour towards him do not happen to ſquare exactly with theſe his ſovereign notions and high conceit of himſelf, he will be apt to think, or ſome officious flatterer will be ready to perſuade him, 'his royal authority is ſet at nought, the people are revolted; and what remains but they take arms.' To puniſh therefore their Diſobedience, he proceeds to violence, and exerciſes real ſeverity for imaginary guilt. Miſchief is prolific; and violence in him begets reſentment in them: The people murmur and exclaim; the prince is thence provoked, and flies to vengeance; when one act of vengeance is reſented and expoſed, as it ever will be, more will follow. Thus things go on; affection is not only loſt, but irrecoverable on either ſide, hatred is begun on both; and prince and people conſider themſelves no longer as magiſtrate and ſubject, but one another as enemies.

Mr. *Gordon* ſays thus, of this *royal martyr*'s reign, in his *Independent Whig* *, "Now, if we enquire into the firſt cauſe, from which all the reſt naturally followed, we ſhall find that the violence of his reign cauſed his violent end. It is not to be denied nor diſguiſed, that from the very beginning the court aimed at arbitrary power, openly purſued it, and for fifteen years together practiſed it, raiſing money without law, and againſt law; which was robbery in thoſe who enforced the collection of it: impriſoning men, the beſt and greateſt men, without law, and againſt law; which was lawleſs cruelty: ſeizing the lands and eſtates of others, without right, and againſt right; which was flagrant oppreſſion and violence: aſſuming and exerciſing a power to diſpence with laws, that is, to make and annul laws, which was manifeſt uſurpation;

* Vol. III. p. 361.

tion: and, in ſhort, eſtabliſhing an arbitrary and *Turkiſh* authority over the perſons, and rights, and and fortunes of the people, which was apparent and undeniable *Tyranny.*'

'Between law and violence, between right and tyranny, there is no medium, no more than between juſtice and oppreſſion. If king *Charles* had no right to act thus, then his acting thus was *tyranny.* If he had a right, of what force are laws and oaths; and where is our conſtitution, the boaſted rights of *Engliſhmen* and our ancient *Magna Charta?* Why was his ſon king *James* turned out? why declared to have forfeited? And I would aſk the admirers and defenders of king *Charles* I. how they would have liked, how borne ſuch violences, ſuch lawleſs doings and miſrule in king *William?* now in the late reign? how in this? How would they have reliſhed the impriſonment of their perſons, taxes laid on, and exacted without conſent of parliament, arbitrary and exceſſive fines, their eſtates ſeized, their families impoveriſhed or famiſhing? Doubtleſs no men would have been louder in the cry of tyranny; and very juſt and natural would have been ſuch a cry. How do they reconcile ſuch zeal and profeſſion with an approbation of the reign of king *Charles* I. which was one continued ſeries of oppreſſions, had aboliſhed liberty and law, and eſtabliſhed univerſal ſlavery?'——

'Was it not crying guilt in the crown to abandon its duty, to violate the coronation-oath, to tread upon law and juſtice, to perſecute conſcience, rob and oppreſs the people, and from limited and awful to become lawleſs and arbitrary? And is it not equally reaſonable, equally becoming us *Engliſhmen*, and freemen, to commemorate and deteſt that adminiſtration ſo pernicious and devouring, meaſures ſo black and lawleſs? Is it not our duty

to take warning by them, and whenever we are threatened with them, to guard against them, to watch every principle of slavery, and suppress it betimes; to rejoice that we live in happier times, live in a *free government*, and under *the free course of the laws*, to pray for the continuance of such an invaluable blessing, and be dutiful and assisting to that GOOD AND GREAT PRINCE who secures it to us, and claims nothing to himself, but what our parliaments and known laws give him."——

Seeing we have *now* the *best of kings* to govern us, which is the greatest of all national blessings, let us not grieve that our fathers delivered themselves from *tyranny* by their struggles, and us from the pernicious consequences of it. Have we not more reason to rejoice, that the parliament's army got the better of the king's, than if the king's army had got the better of the parliament's? for whereas we now lament *one* day in the year, should we not then have lamented *every* day in the year? We might have sought the freedom we now enjoy in *America*, we should not have found it in *Britain*. If we were not ungrateful to that God who redeemed us, he would give us *feasting* for *fasting*, and *the oil of gladness for the spirit of heaviness*, we should thank God for his mercies to us, instead of complaining and repining before him of his judgments to them, seeing *in the midst of judgment* to them *he hath remembered mercy* to us.

As the lesson for this day is the sufferings of our blessed Lord, and as *Charles*'s devotees are fond of making an analogy between them, I shall grant there was some in their *deaths*, though there was none at all in their *lives*; for the one went about doing good with his power, and saving the lives of men; the other went about doing mischief with his army, and destroying men's lives, to defend his power

power, and maintain his prerogative. But both friends and enemies allow that *he died a good death.* It was a national good that *one man died for the people, and the nation periſhed not.* In ſuch caſe therefore, it may be looked on as a kind of propitiatory ſacrifice, and his death may be *imputed righteouſneſs*, which brought temporal redemption to the nation, as the death of Chriſt brought ſpiritual redemption to the world. As he died a *good man*, we muſt allow his death was unfortunate and is cauſe of mourning; but as he died a *bad king* the death of ſuch a one is fortunate, and matter of joy to any people. Thus juſtly ſtating both ſides of the account, we may ſet equal reaſons of joy againſt equal cauſe of ſorrow, ſo cancel each other, and make the balance even. And as our fathers have ſent him to his heavenly father, and have followed him themſelves, *Requieſcant omnes in pace.* If God is reconciled with them, as we ought in charity to believe, there is a reconciliation between God and and his people; therefore we ought to be reconciled with one another.

FINIS.